

Serial No. 09/882,409

REMARKS

Claims 148, 149, and 154 have been canceled, leaving for consideration examined claims 82, 96, 104, 105, 114, and 115. The withdrawn claims remain pending in the case.

The examined claims directed to a color filter have been canceled; thus, the claims under examination are directed to a structure for pattern formation, a method for pattern formation, an element, and processes for producing an element. With the cancellation of claims 148, 149, and 154, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the examined claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1 to 24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,450,635 and the related rejection of pending examined claims for obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1 to 17 of U.S. Patent 6,554,420 are respectfully traversed. The two cited patents are related, the latter being a divisional of the former, and both are directed to color filters and methods of making same. Moreover, the claims in the two cited patents require an inkjet system to provide a picture element in the color filter. The examined claims don't relate to or embrace such a concept. As

Serial No. 09/882,409

indicated above, the remaining examined claims do not relate to a color filter of any type, let alone the specified articles indicated in the claims of the patents, and, for this reason alone, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The ongoing rejection of the remaining examined claims under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by GB '589 is also respectfully traversed. Applicants pointed out in detail on pages 66 and 67 of the Amendment Under 37 CFR 1.111 filed December 31, 2003 that the upper exposure limit in GB '589 is 1/184,000 the radiation amount of Example A-4 shown in the specification at pages 92 and 93. Applicants say with respect that the extraordinarily low upper limit of light irradiation in GB '589 is far too small to produce a sufficient quantity of ultraviolet ray needed to photoexcite titanium oxide to obtain an oxidation-reduction function or a hydrophilic function. It is also to be noted that the reference was published in 1973 and it is respectfully submitted that the reference lacks sufficient acceptable disclosure to make the document a proper reference to the claims there.

Serial No. 09/882,409

Reconsideration of the case is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

September 29, 2004
Date

Charles A. Wendel
Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453

CAW/ch
Attorney Docket No. YMTA:002A

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220

(rev. 3/3/00)